DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 512 SO 030 491

AUTHOR May, Wanda T.
TITLE Art/Music Teachers' Curriculum Deliberations. Elementary Subjects Center Series No. 22.
INSTITUTION Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, East Lansing, MI.; Michigan State Univ., East Lansing. Inst. for Research on Teaching.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Oct 90
CONTRACT G0098C0226
NOTE 56p.; For a related document, see SO 030 490.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Education; Art Teachers; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Problems; Curriculum Research; Elementary Education; Instructional Materials; *Music Education; Music Teachers; Teaching (Occupation); Teaching Experience; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the nature and substance of elementary art/music teachers' curriculum deliberations from several points of view, presenting: (1) an art teacher who initially thought she was wrestling with a discipline problem instead of a curricular problem; (2) a post-observation conversation (instigated by a dissatisfied principal) between a veteran art teacher and a less experienced art teacher; (3) three music teachers engaged in weekly after-school planning sessions of their own design; and (4) 10 art teachers in the institutional context of weekly staff meetings conducted by an art supervisor. The theoretical framework used to describe curriculum deliberation draws from the work of Dewey, Reid, Schwab, and Walker. Schwab's curriculum "commonplaces" (teacher, student, subject matter, and milieu) are used as a framework for analyzing the primary interests expressed in teachers' deliberations and to illustrate the reflexive interplay of these concerns in how teachers frame curriculum problems, make decisions, and act upon these decisions in their practice. Implications for action research, collaborative inquiry, and professional development are raised throughout the paper. (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328512

4.5 50

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

WANDA T. MAY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 22

ART/MUSIC TEACHERS' CURRICULUM DELIBERATIONS

Wanda T. May

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

Institute for Research on Teaching
College of Education
Michigan State University

SO 030 291

MSU is an affirmative action/equal opportunity institution

Elementary Subjects Center
Series No. 22

ART/MUSIC TEACHERS' CURRICULUM DELIBERATIONS

Wanda T. May

Published by

The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects
Institute for Research on Teaching
252 Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034

October 1990

This work is sponsored in part by the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching, Michigan State University. The Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects is funded primarily by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the position, policy, or endorsement of the Office or Department (Cooperative Agreement No. G0098C0226).

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects

The **Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects** was awarded to Michigan State University in 1987 after a nationwide competition. Funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, the Elementary Subjects Center is a major project housed in the Institute for Research on Teaching (IRT). The program focuses on conceptual understanding, higher order thinking, and problem solving in elementary school teaching of mathematics, science, social studies, literature, and the arts. Center researchers are identifying exemplary curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in the teaching of these school subjects; studying these practices to build new hypotheses about how the effectiveness of elementary schools can be improved; testing these hypotheses through school-based research; and making specific recommendations for the improvement of school policies, instructional materials, assessment procedures, and teaching practices. Research questions include, What content should be taught when teaching these subjects for understanding and use of knowledge? How do teachers concentrate their teaching to use their limited resources best? and In what ways is good teaching subject matter- specific?

The work is designed to unfold in three phases, beginning with literature review and interview studies designed to elicit and synthesize the points of view of various stakeholders (representatives of the underlying academic disciplines, intellectual leaders and organizations concerned with curriculum and instruction in school subjects, classroom teachers, state- and district-level policymakers) concerning ideal curriculum, instruction, and evaluation practices in these five content areas at the elementary level. Phase II involves interview and observation methods designed to describe current practice, and in particular, best practice as observed in the classrooms of teachers believed to be outstanding. Phase II also involves analysis of curricula (both widely used curriculum series and distinctive curricula developed with special emphasis on conceptual understanding and higher order applications), as another approach to gathering information about current practices. In Phase III, models of ideal practice will be developed, based on what has been learned and synthesized from the first two phases, and will be tested through classroom intervention studies.

The findings of Center research are published by the IRT in the Elementary Subjects Center Series. Information about the Center is included in the IRT Communication Quarterly (a newsletter for practitioners) and in lists and catalogs of IRT publications. For more information, to receive a list or catalog, or to be placed on the IRT mailing list to receive the newsletter, please write to the Editor, Institute for Research on Teaching, 252 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034.

Co-directors:	Jere E. Brophy and Penelope L. Peterson
Senior Researchers:	Patricia Cianciolo, Sandra Hollingsworth, Magdalene Lampert, Wanda May, Richard Prawat, Ralph Putnam, Cheryl Rosaen, Kathleen Roth, Suzanne Wilson
Editor:	Sandra Gross
Editorial Assistant:	Brian H. Bode

Abstract

This paper describes the nature and substance of elementary art/music teachers' curriculum deliberations from several points of view: (1) one art teacher who initially thought she was wrestling with a discipline problem instead of a curricular problem; (2) a postobservation conversation (instigated by a dissatisfied principal) between a veteran art teacher and a less experienced art teacher; (3) three music teachers engaged in weekly after-school planning sessions of their own design; and (4) ten art teachers in the institutional context of weekly staff meetings conducted by an art supervisor.

The theoretical framework used to describe curriculum deliberation draws from the work of Dewey, Reid, Schwab, and Walker. Schwab's curriculum "commonplaces" (teacher, student, subject matter, and milieu) are used as a framework for analyzing the primary interests expressed in teachers' deliberations and to illustrate the reflexive interplay of these concerns in how teachers frame curriculum problems, make decisions, and act upon these decisions in their practice. Implications for action research, collaborative inquiry, and professional development are raised throughout the paper.

ART/MUSIC TEACHERS' CURRICULUM DELIBERATIONS[1]

Wanda T. May [2]

I begin this paper with my view of what curriculum, curriculum development, and teaching are and/or entail as deliberation. The paper then is divided into three major sections, moving from the deliberations of an individual art teacher to teachers in the institutional context of weekly staff meetings. Even though these levels or arenas of curriculum deliberation interact reflexively and do not exist in isolation, I explore curriculum deliberation through different lenses, shifting our focus and attention in these ways: (1) a teacher's personal practical knowledge, (2) collegial conversations and collaboration which embody curricular concerns, and (3) missed opportunities for deliberation within the context of formal staff meetings. In each section, you will meet teachers grappling with the arts in terms of creating opportunities to learn--for themselves as well as their students. I draw upon several case studies of art teachers, one of music teachers, and our own narratives to illustrate the complex features of curriculum deliberation and the rich possibilities for professional development.

Curriculum, Curriculum Development, and Teaching

Like many contemporary curriculum scholars, I define curriculum broadly as "what students have an opportunity to learn (and not)." We learn from that which is omitted and ignored as much as from what is presented or emphasized. Eisner (1985) coined such omissions, the "null" curriculum. For example, although almost all students say they enjoy art and learn many things, as early as second grade, they say that art is not important compared to other school subjects (May, 1985); this perception persists for many persons throughout school (Goodlad, 1984) and adulthood. Much of this is due to the slighting or omission of the arts in the total school curriculum and what students learn (or do not learn) when art is included. Reasons for this disciplinary "pecking order" are beyond the

---

[1]A version of this work is to appear in R. Neperud (Ed.), The analysis of change in aesthetics and art education. New York: Teachers College Press.

[2]Wanda T. May, assistant professor of teacher education at Michigan State University, is a senior researcher with the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

scope of this paper. However, most educators understand that disciplinary legitimacy, interests, and contestations within and among disciplines and their loose connection to school subjects have a long sociopolitical history. Finally, hidden and null curricula also operate within the boundaries of art education, art programs, and classrooms where students have opportunities to develop particular understandings and ways of knowing art, and not others (Hamblen, 1985; Jackson, 1987; Johnson, 1985; May, 1987).

Opportunities to learn (and not) are created and influenced by an art teacher's knowledge or depth and breadth of understanding of art as a way of knowing and a worthwhile subject of study; the teacher's decisions and actions in art class; what interests, understandings, and experiences students bring to this class; the communities and cultures represented by students and teachers in a given context, and how these interact; and the structural and cultural context of schools (allocation of time and resources, social roles and relations, institutional rites and rituals). The above list ignores other important influences, but these primary areas represent Schwab's (1962) "desiderata" or four "commonplaces" of the curriculum: subject matter, milieu, learner, and teacher. These commonplaces are a set of factors which occur in statements about the aims, content, and methods of the curriculum, which also figure prominently in teachers' discourse, decision making, and practice.

While there are numerous influences on what students have an opportunity to learn (and not), a key factor related to public schools is the teacher. It is the teacher who constructs, presents, selects, negotiates, mediates, and evaluates what students learn about art in schools. It is the teacher who makes learning meaningful and memorable (or not). More broadly, however, it is the teacher--as an adult and professional--who assumes many roles and responsibilities in educating others about the arts, from the most obvious context of teaching in K-12 art classrooms, to working on school or art curriculum committees, serving as an experienced teacher working with novice teachers, sponsoring an after-school art club, educating parents about one's program or a youngster's progress, lobbying for policies or legislation that promote the arts as a significant and legitimate way of knowing in schools, engaging in interdisciplinary planning and teaching with classroom teachers, or

teaching art in a community center, summer camp, or senior citizens center.

All of the above kinds of endeavors are opportunities to learn--not only for those with whom the teacher relates but also for the teacher. Further, no matter how "autonomous" teachers perceive their decisions or work, teaching ultimately is a public and moral endeavor. Decisions and actions move reflexively "in the pursuit of understanding subject matter (objects, concepts, events, relations) and people...where action without reference to the ultimate good of learning" would be rudderless (Buchmann, 1988, p. 5).

The central focus throughout this paper, then, is on teachers, their creation of the curriculum and the various ways in which they construct curriculum reflexively in the contexts of classroom, school, and district as active and thoughtful learners and content specialists. I am unable to promote or sustain artificial separations: curriculum/instruction, content/process, what/how, theory/practice, teachers/learners, fact/value, and curriculum development/ professional development. Such distinctions do not adequately reflect (nor help us address) the complex nature of teaching and learning, the practical dimensions and social context(s) of our work, nor the language we use to describe what we have done, should have done, are doing, can do, want to do, ought to do, and why. We respond to concrete situations that make circumstantial demands on our practical and moral perception (Buchmann, 1988; van Manen, 1982). Buchmann (1988) suggests that our private and public deliberations and arguments involve

> contents, persons, conflicts, and interpretations; together with criticism and regrets, these elements account for the continuity and inconclusiveness of teacher thinking, as well as for its abiding interest.... The difficulty is that, having reached a conclusion, there are always further premises that, being added, could turn the pondered action into rather less than a good thing, or reverse its course altogether. (pp. 10-11)

Buchmann reminds us that in the practical world, making a decision and arriving at a conclusion is no simple matter of "climbing a ladder" of beliefs and then jumping into action. Practical reasoning involves weighing the pros and cons of a particular action and realizing that this action is only

one of many alternatives. Each alternative has both predictable and unforeseeable consequences for both teachers and learners.

Some view curriculum development as a simplistic, linear, step-by-step process (i.e., planning, implementing, and evaluating) which results in a written statement: policy artifact, curriculum guide, or unit/lesson plan. However, this view of curriculum development and practice may not result in a product (or at least one that all would perceive as worthwhile and useful), faithful implementation of these ideas in individual classrooms, nor guarantee student learning. I view curriculum development as a complex, reflexive, ongoing, and problematic process as well as the disposition to reflect, consider, choose, and act in ways that are more likely (than not) to benefit others equitably and to enrich understanding of the multiple ways in which we view the world and act in it humanely. I view curriculum development, then, as deliberation (Dewey, 1904; Gauthier, 1963; Greene, 1978; Reid, 1978; Schwab, 1969; Walker, 1971). Deliberation occurs inside an individual's head or among colleagues creating and acting upon curriculum decisions. It may or may not result in a document. Whether a proposal or action, it is grounded in practice.

In deliberation, our decisions and actions are grounded in the practical and a view of the possible, in what we believe will work and what we believe is worth knowing and pursuing, is true, beautiful, good, and just. Some of our beliefs are more tacit than others. Most of our beliefs hardly mirror a single "formal" theory external to our own experience and practice. Nevertheless, our personal histories, social situatedness, contemporary circumstances, and confidence in tomorrow or a "next time" all merge to help us choose and act, more or less thoughtfully and successfully, in relation to others in the present and with an eye toward the future. Connelly and Clandinin (1988) call this an abiding "image" each of us uses in our teaching, "...something within our experience, embodied in us as persons and expressed and enacted in our practices and actions" (p. 60). We each hold different images developed from our personal practical knowledge. (For example, in the following section we will explore Rachel's image of art as "getting ideas.") In the active life of teaching, however, not all choices are clear, nor when they are made, can they be revised.

Sometimes, "what is done is done: Only the thought of it [action taken] can be changed" (Buchmann, 1988, p. 14).

There are two significant objects of teaching (Buchmann, 1988). The first object is contemplative in character: the subject matter of teaching, or "the consideration and love of truth in all its forms, with the teacher taking delight in that consideration and love" (p. 6). What are art teachers to teach if they have no understanding or love of art and why one should experience or know art? The second object of teaching aims at others, at connecting with and enlightening other persons. It is communicated through actions, discourse, and demonstration with the impulse to share what we value and have contemplated. What are art teachers to teach if they have no understanding of what art can engender in others; or what others might understand, appreciate, or bring to this experience; and to what effects for them?

Shulman (1987) breaks down the objects and categories of teachers' knowledge further. At minimum, able teachers would have knowledge and facility in the following areas:

> content knowledge
>
> general pedagogical knowledge (broad principles and strategies of classroom management and organization that appear to transcend subject matter)
>
> curriculum knowledge (with a particular grasp of the materials and programs that serve as "tools of the trade" for teachers)
>
> pedagogical content knowledge (that special amalgam of content and pedagogy that is uniquely the province of teachers, their own special form of professional understanding)
>
> knowledge of learners and their characteristics
>
> knowledge of educational contexts (ranging from the workings of the group or classroom to the character of communities and cultures)
>
> knowledge of educational ends, purposes, and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds (p. 8)

Shulman's definition of curriculum knowledge is limited and does not reflect the definition and parameters of curriculum presented earlier. Of special interest, however, is the category called "pedagogical content knowledge" because it represents "the blending of content and pedagogy into an understanding of how particular topics, problems, or issues are organized, represented, and adapted to the diverse interests and abilities of learners, and presented for instruction" (p. 8).

Pedagogical content knowledge involves comprehending and transforming important, and often taught, topics and ideas in one's subject area. It includes finding "the most useful forms of representation of those ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations--in a word, the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others" (Shulman, 1986, p. 9). It includes a teacher's understanding of "what makes the learning of specific topics easy or difficult: the conceptions and preconceptions that students of different ages and backgrounds bring with them" to learning (p. 9). Finally, pedagogical content knowledge involves a process of thinking through, reasoning, and solving problems, which involves "the generation of or evaluation of alternative representations of the subject matter" (Wilson, 1989, p. 8). Able teachers know how to build and extend their representational repertoires.

Curriculum as a Teacher's Personal Practical Knowledge

To anchor the above discussion concretely, I introduce you to Rachel, an elementary art teacher. The following description of Rachel's practice and portions of one of our conversations occur after participating with and observing Rachel twice a week for several weeks teaching two second- and two fifth-grade art classes. Imagine yourself as Rachel's friend or colleague rather than an art supervisor or principal evaluating her performance. Together, you and Rachel are trying to understand her beliefs and practice so that she can reflect, experiment, and choose actions which she perceives will be authentic and successful, personally and pedagogically. Several weeks into the fall term and near tears, Rachel states she has a problem with all of her fifth-grade classes: discipline. She asks for your help.

What unfolds in the following description and conversation are issues central to curriculum deliberation. When reading the following account, rather than focus narrowly on Rachel's "discipline problem," why this is a problem, and what she ought to do about it, consider these topics: Rachel's epistemology or view of knowledge; her understanding of art and what one learns in art; her personal narrative or "story" and how this text is embodied in her curriculum and image of art, teaching, and learning; and how this image may have evolved and is expressed in her current practice. In other words, think about how Rachel's experiences are reflexively related to her beliefs and practice.

A Fifth-Grade Art Lesson With Rachel

This is Rachel's fourth year as an itinerant art specialist teaching nearly 400 students in two elementary schools. Art classes are once a week in 45-minute periods and are conducted in a room designated as "the art room." Students are seated four to a table, with six rectangular tables arranged in a "hexagon" within the classroom space. Despite a quiet arrival in the hall, students enter the classroom noisily and fight over chairs. Even though Rachel devised a seating chart and there are assigned seats, Rachel may or may not check this chart or insist all students sit in their assigned seats. Rachel knows most students by name because she has worked with them for two years; however, there are several students she does not know by name.

Rachel begins most art lessons by showing students two contrasting prints of adult art (e.g., Cezanne and Van Gogh), small or calendar-sized, related to the art concepts she will present (warm-cool colors, cityscape-landscape, etc.). She mostly asks students to describe what they see and to compare and contrast the prints. Sometimes, she asks them to interpret with "What do you think is going on in this painting?" "How does this painting make you feel?" or "How do you think the artist felt about X?" and why. Many students are not attentive to this presentation while poking each other, rolling pencils, or kicking each other under their tables. Rachel's presentation is punctuated with "sh-sh's" and "You need to listen so you'll know what to do." Presentation with questions and answers usually lasts about 10 minutes, never includes a demonstration with the media students will be using, and ends with "Who has an idea of what he

or she might do today (in relation to warm colors, line, etc.)?" Some students volunteer the subject matter they could create in their art work; most do not.

Distribution of materials takes some time, as often not all of the materials are ready for immediate use. While a few students begin their art, others wait for materials. Whether or not students have all necessary materials, several remain off-task and become increasingly disruptive throughout the period. Some ask what they are supposed to do. Several say they "can't think of anything to make." Rachel may move one or two of the most disruptive students to work by themselves. At some point during the period, three or four students will throw paper wads at each other or pencils over the drying line, stretched diagonally across a corner of the room. At least two students will get into a verbal or physical fight, will be attended to by Rachel, separated, and talked to privately about their behavior before class dismissal.

Students work approximately 10-15 minutes making an art object with Rachel rotating around the room assisting individual students and students getting out of their seats to seek Rachel's attention. When patiently attending to an individual, Rachel does not seem to notice three students chasing each other around a table or two boys having a mock sword fight with their scissors. Students' conversations while making art rarely relate to art--the lesson's objectives, manipulation of materials or tools, techniques, experimentation, or interpretation and evaluation of each others' efforts or work. Most of the students' artwork is disappointing (to me) in terms of following directions, demonstrating the objective(s) of the lesson, illustrating what most students at this grade level are capable of creating, idea development and elaboration, technical skill, appropriate use of materials and tools, and perseverance. Most students do not seem challenged by the lesson or materials, express little satisfaction or dissatisfaction about what they have accomplished or made, and few seem curious about what their peers created.

Soon, Rachel announces "clean-up time." Clean-up takes 15-20 minutes with increasing chaos. Rachel turns the lights on and off periodically to get attention, but noise subsides for only a minute or so. Art class often runs over the allotted 45-minute period, with the classroom teacher waiting patiently and silently at the door for his/her students.

Students suddenly become quiet upon exiting the art room, and no noise can be heard from the hallway as they return to their classroom.

A Conversation With Rachel Over Nachos

After a few weeks of observation, Rachel and I go to a nearby restaurant after school to engage in one of our first lengthy conversations about her beliefs and practice as an art teacher. We agree to tape the conversation so that we will have a common text or transcript to read and reflect upon after our conversation.

Rachel: There's always been this struggle for me [as an artist] with where your ideas come from and what's important to you. "Why do you do this if you don't have anything interesting to say?" It's always been kind of a struggle in my own art getting that established because I felt really inferior at times with that...grappling with that question.... I haven't had a lot of help with that at all, and I felt like that was a real key thing that you deal with [as an artist]. I've had life drawing and painting that was...a way to get at material but not a way to get at what it is that drives you to do it.

Wanda: So, the motivation behind it?

Rachel: Hmm.

Wanda: Is that why you've focused a lot in your teaching on [students] "getting ideas"?

Rachel: Yeah.... I think it's really important to have your own idea and being motivated by that. But, how do you get--I mean, there are things that drive--that turn that wheel (points to head). Getting that going is not just automatic. Certain things have to be sort of talked through or sparked...and in a group, I think you can really work at that--at least, address it initially.

Wanda: Is this why--I know a lot of times you show kids visuals...but I rarely see you show other kids' examples that they've done, or your own, or actually cut the thing out and do it [demonstrate].

Rachel: Yeah.

Wanda: Are you afraid of stifling their own ideas?

Rachel: Yeah, a little bit. I have done that, but it's been the wrong way.... Last year, a lot of kids cut out the one I did. Well, that was frustrating to me. It was because I didn't show them other ways to do it....

Wanda: But, it's an interesting dilemma about how to help kids get ideas.

Rachel: Hmm. Maybe that comes in with the trust.... If I had more trust in what--how they could--you know, if I had more structure and trust in what they could do, I would... [long pause]. I use some things, I think, for structure and control that aren't really...usable that way.

Wanda: Like what?

Rachel: The idea thing. I think if they have an idea as they're sitting down waiting for their materials, that that's on their mind--not using their scissors or glue or whatever they might get into. It's a little...quirky thing that I've developed.

Wanda: But, you do tend to resist doing examples for them or showing them examples [student-made or teacher-made]. You could have four or five things and then put them up [out of sight, after discussing their uniquenesses, multiple interpretations, and the potential for their unique interpretations].

Rachel: That's true. That's another way of evaluation, too.

Wanda: That you could evaluate.

Rachel: For them to evaluate...what it is I'm approving of....

Wanda: That this is appropriate, and this isn't? This is a good idea because...this is a good idea because?

Rachel: Right.

Wanda: Sometimes, I think they might have trouble coming up with an idea. The subject matter is too open.

Rachel: Yeah, you're right...because it has in my past only come from me. I haven't had the luxury of having it be stimulated. I don't think I have in my whole art education had that sort of stimulation. It's a good point. I'm thinking maybe I'm frustrated with that, and yet I'm perpetuating that in what I do.

We continue discussing the nature of Rachel's teacher preparation in art education.

Rachel: No, it [course work] was always project-oriented--not the materials and getting the materials--how do we structure it. No, I didn't have that.

Wanda: So, you're supposed to know how to do that [automatically know how to organize materials and instruction].

Rachel: Right. This is supposed to magically come about because you have these wonderful creative ideas that you've thought of that are so different from all these teachers that have the same of everything. It's like that's the thing they hold over your head: "It can't be that way, but we don't know what to tell you otherwise. Just kind of go in there." It isn't very structured at all.

Later, we discuss Rachel's most vivid memories of art learning as an elementary student. Rachel has positive memories of her third-grade classroom teacher who drew a portrait of her and introduced her to charcoal and other "sophisticated" materials and artistic behaviors for third grade (such as shading with charcoal or sketching outdoors). However, she remembers having an itinerant art teacher in her upper elementary grades, finding this experience negative and "stupid."

Wanda: How come? What was stupid about it?

Rachel: It had nothing to do with anything. He'd just come in and say "clowns," and we'd have this plate in front of us, and we're supposed to do clowns. It was always just a project.

Wanda: Make and take?

Rachel: Yeah.... He came infrequently, too. It wasn't that often--it wasn't regular.... It was short, too. It was a real short period. He just barely got stuff out...and it was over. I cared more about our [classroom] teacher giving us responsibility to set up the bulletin board and having us decide what we were going to do for that season, and we had all the responsibility of thinking of something catchy, and that was really fun doing that.

After discussing memories of kindergarten and third-grade art, Rachel vividly recalls the art objects she made.

Rachel: [In the third grade, sketching] outside, I remember that, with charcoal that we used it in a way--we were taught about the charcoal material. And we made these plaster casts and painted them and carved them.... We made things out of this can. We brought in the can. We...used

different materials. I made a clown face with these big egg-carton eyes, and I had yarn on the head. I mean, I kept these for a long time, so I can visualize--I can still see them. I remember the colors on the plaster things that I carved.... [In kindergarten], we did a sponge project with paint. It was very wild. I remember kids all over the place, but I remember being really into it.... I remember being around a lot of chaos and activity when I was doing it. It seemed wild compared to other classes.

Wanda: So, you remember things you made.

Rachel: Yeah, oh yeah.

Wanda: Do you remember that more than you remember things like line, shape, pattern?

Rachel: Oh, yes. I don't think that was ever taught to me. If it was, I don't remember.

Wanda: You don't remember anything about artists?

Rachel: Oh, no. I didn't even hear anything about artists until I was in my senior year in a humanities class, and I'd had several art courses in high school--not heard a word about other artists. And I took this humanities course, and I was just [gasps] in awe. Michelangelo, and all these--I was just dumbfounded. I couldn't believe this existed! That was wonderful to find out when I finally did.

Rachel said that art history was a favorite subject in college, even though most of her course work was in studio; of this coursework, most of it related to producing two-dimensional art forms with a major in printmaking. Rachel described her own art work as "abstract." She has never been involved in exhibiting her own work since her senior show in college, and she has never been a member of a local community arts group or participated in crafts fairs or sidewalk shows as an artist. Except for working on her post-BFA, "plus-27" credits in the area of painting, Rachel is virtually isolated in her own artistic growth as well as in her professional development as an art teacher.

A central image or theme that surfaces in Rachel's narrative is "getting ideas." "Getting ideas" was important to Rachel as an elementary student working cooperatively on bulletin boards or resisting predefined projects like paper-plate clowns. As a former fine arts student, Rachel reports that she often felt inadequate in "getting ideas" and still struggles with this as an artist. She transfers this image of "getting ideas" to her art

classes by asking students--after presenting art concepts such as line or pattern--what ideas they have for subject matter for their impending art products. Rachel worries about stifling students' ideas or promoting copying if she shows examples of teacher- or student-made products or demonstrates techniques, steps, or procedures. Yet, most students seem baffled and frustrated without this information.

During this conversation, Rachel suddenly recognizes that this emphasis on "getting ideas" actually may stimulate and perpetuate student frustration rather than ideas. She interprets the future use of concrete examples as a potentially positive form of "student evaluation" of art objects and art criticism. However, what she really implies is using these objects to clarify objectives, procedures, or desirable outcomes to help students understand better what is expected of them in terms of "good ideas" or to see what will be deemed appropriate and successful by the teacher. Since there is no follow-up discussion or little evaluative talk during a lesson or at the end, one must interpret Rachel's notion of incorporating concrete examples for "evaluation" as structural and procedural information, not as art criticism. Given her immediate problems with management and discipline, however, Rachel's view of evaluation as a structural device might temporarily help her address part of her discipline problem.

Rachel found her college methods courses inadequate in terms of getting "creative ideas" (compared to classroom teachers) and developing procedural knowledge about organizing and structuring learning for students. She found her art content courses inadequate in terms of helping her, as an artist, conceive of ideas that would communicate something important she wished to convey to viewers but adequate in terms of learning how to work with materials and techniques. She distinguishes "getting ideas" from "projects," "procedures," and "techniques." While she ought to be most familiar with procedural knowledge in terms of manipulating materials and techniques, she never includes this in her own instruction.

Rachel's abiding image of "getting ideas" is problematic because she has not figured out how to resolve the tension between personal reflection or planning and the social stimulation of ideas in the name of teaching and learning. To Rachel, is art knowledge received or reflexive? Private or public? Does it occur in a vacuum inside one's head, or is it socially constructed and mediated? The legitimate sources of ideas and methods to

stimulate these ideas remain a mystery to Rachel, even though she parrots an elementary art textbook author by telling students that artists get their ideas from observation and imagination.

Rachel seems to have a rather romantic view of the creative process in terms of problem finding, problem solving, and idea production: After private, independent reflection and observation, and with little or no stimulation from others, artists think of unique ideas and produce unique art objects which communicate something of importance to the artist. This activity appears to occur only in the mind of the artist. Studying or mimicking subject matter, techniques, or styles of other artists; transforming ideas from one art form or discipline to another; forming ideas after making initial marks or fooling around with materials; problem solving within imposed limitations or boundaries; working cooperatively on a project rather than independently; or apprenticing do not fit very well into Rachel's image of "getting ideas" as an artist, teacher, or learner. For Rachel, the mysterious nature of "getting ideas" is highlighted in the ways she talks about the "luxury" and desire to have her own ideas "stimulated" by others. She claims that there is a magical, unrealistic expectation of university professors that beginning art teachers will have better, more "creative" ideas than their classroom-teacher counterparts. She admits that as a preservice teacher, she did not fully understand what art teachers' ideas look like in comparison, beyond colored dittos or 30 pumpkins just alike. What does "stimulating or getting ideas" really look like in practice?

Rachel states she uses "getting ideas" as a control device, naively expecting students to engage in self-discipline, quietly and productively reflecting on what they will create while patiently waiting for materials and supplies. Students do not seem to perceive nor understand "waiting" as an opportunity to engage in artistic behavior, and they do not respond to waiting as Rachel hoped they would. There is a natural conflict here in terms of "command idea production" and the freedom most artists enjoy in choosing their time and place for idea production. As a context for idea generation and development, classrooms are not studios. Most adult artists do not go to school for inspiration or observation to "get ideas" for their work.

Later, Rachel identifies "evaluation" and the potential use of locally made examples as a control device rather than as a form of art criticism, student self-evaluation, or a means to help students develop self-regulated learning strategies with respect to developing and manipulating their own ideas. In schools, no matter the subject, "control must be maintained, work must be ordered, and the students' interests must be aroused and sustained" (Lortie, 1975, p. 152). Accomplishing group tasks and attending to students' expressive needs are contradictory efforts. Students are accustomed to perceiving teachers (as adults and teachers) as the ultimate "conceptualizers" of their work in terms of what needs to be done and how--as "assigners, managers, and evaluators" of their efforts and products. Artists do not have others conceptualize their work for them. Artists usually do not seek nor depend upon the opinion and evaluation of their work from the public or art critics until their work is completed and exhibited. Ultimately, artists conceptualize and evaluate their own work.

Finally, even in kindergarten, Rachel recalls that art was "wild," "chaotic," and exciting. Despite art activities seeming wild compared to normal educational fare, Rachel remembers being able to concentrate, being "into" the activities. Thus, as a teacher, Rachel may have more tolerance for chaos and disruption in art class than some of us because she remembers as a student being able to concentrate and produce cherished objects amid chaos. For several weeks, Rachel reasoned that students' misbehavior in art class was understandable and forgivable in the context of "overly rigid" classroom teachers (whether or not this premise was grounded in evidence). Thus, Rachel viewed art class as potentially therapeutic for students in the greater scheme of things. Perhaps they needed to "blow off," "relax" a little, even though Rachel surmised that students would have <u>some</u> initial difficulty making such transitions in the school context. However, Rachel began to understand that her decision <u>not</u> to act or to impose structure had mushroomed beyond her control. She now admitted that she was unable to teach art.

Rachel then interpreted misbehavior as students' viewing art as "merely play time" and not taking art class or her seriously enough. Thus, her premises shifted from "milieu" or school context to blaming the students for their misbehavior. Without changing any other instructional strategies, in mid-October Rachel created and posted rules for the art room

and firmly went over these with students, to little avail. She then reasoned that part of the problem was not having enough minutes in an art period to accomplish what needed to be done and entertained the idea of lobbying the principal and staff for more minutes per period. She shifted the problem back to "milieu" which, this time, included both school and art-class contexts. When I did a detailed, time-on-task analysis for several art periods and grade levels one week to help Rachel test out her theory, the results suggested to Rachel that her request for more time was unreasonable until she "got a better handle" on the time available to her. Thus, she reformulated the problem as an instructional one, focusing on herself and what to do about her teaching.

While working diligently on organization, however (when it took more time to see a change in student behavior than she expected), Rachel hypothesized that students were unruly in art class because they had all their "special" classes scheduled on the same day (PE, music, and art), with art scheduled in the afternoon. They "had no structure at all" on the day art class was scheduled. Thus, Rachel reformulated the problem as contextual, beyond the parameters of her classroom. While this may have been a legitimate, contributing factor, Rachel soon dropped negotiating a schedule change when she became more interested and determined to focus on what was going on in her classroom, why, and how to change this. No matter what students were experiencing outside of art class on a particular day, Rachel felt she ought to be able to control what happened in her room when the students were with her.

Interestingly, subject matter; learners' interests, abilities, and needs; and pedagogical reasoning (related to Shulman's pedagogical content knowledge) rarely came up in Rachel's premises or framing of this problem. In our conversations, Rachel did not examine nor critique students' products after class, find these particularly underdeveloped (as I did), talk much about how students had or had not met her objectives, focus on what was to be learned about art for a particular lesson and the criteria for meeting those objectives, or notice what individual students struggled with during a particular class or repeatedly, week to week. Overwhelmed with disciplinary concerns (general pedagogical knowledge), Rachel was unable to make significant connections among subject matter, students, learners, and context/milieu. Until we talked, she seemed unaware of her

personal practical knowledge in terms of her image of "getting ideas," what kinds of experiences as a learner and artist may have contributed to this image, and how this image was articulated in her practice and understood (misunderstood) by students.

While Rachel's image of being an artist as "getting ideas" persisted, this image was so fuzzy that it gave her little guidance about "getting ideas" as a teacher--that is, figuring out what about art to teach, how to foster ideas in the classroom, and how to judge her own success and that of her students in this regard. Rachel--as much as her students--needed to see and experience concrete, real-life examples of people "getting ideas," thinking and reasoning aloud, finding and solving problems, manipulating materials, transforming and producing images and ideas, and critiquing these processes and products in a variety of ways. Exactly what kind of ideas did Rachel want students to "get" or create?

How Rachel Helped Herself

Before Rachel turned to me for help, she sought advice from two colleagues--a classroom teacher and an art teacher in another school. She borrowed two commercial booklets on "assertive discipline" from a colleague and double-checked the school's discipline policy. Although she seemed to have a good relationship with the principal, she did not seek her assistance, nor did the principal drop in informally and observe Rachel's teaching. Rachel did not use any of the ideas suggested by the above resources (except for posting a chart of rules).

Without direct assistance, Rachel might have enjoyed and benefited from reading other teachers' autobiographies or case studies of able teachers to understand better the "wisdom of practice" and to appreciate that she is not alone in learning to teach (which is a lifelong endeavor). This source of knowledge, unfortunately, is the least codified and accessible in our profession, unlike other professions such as architecture, law, medicine, or dance. Shulman (1987) states, "One of the frustrations of teaching as an occupation and profession is its extensive individual and collective amnesia, the consistency with which the best creations of its practitioners are lost to both contemporary and future peers" (p. 11). While rich teacher biographies and autobiographies exist (such as Sylvia Ashton-Warner, 1964), I have not seen any related specifically to teaching K-12

visual arts. Nevertheless, some features of pedagogical life and the narratives written by teachers transcend specific content areas, providing us with provocative things to think about with respect to our own practice.

Rachel also might have benefited from "picturing," writing, and revising an autobiography over time, or keeping a diary or journal related to her experiences, ideas, and teaching. There are many educators who promote drawing and writing as meaningful strategies for thinking, reflecting, developing, and testing ideas--for teachers as well as youngsters (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Holly, 1984; Hunt, 1987; May, 1988a, 1988b). Finally, with fine resources and exemplars, Rachel might have engaged in action research, which can encompass diverse questions and systematic forms of inquiry or creative methods (Boud, Keogh & Walker, 1985; Carr & Kemmis, 1986; Hopkins, 1985; Kemmis & McTaggart, 1982; Walker, 1985). Already, Rachel was pursuing questions of intense personal interest, of theoretical and practical import, and hypothesizing not only how to resolve a problem, but what the nature of the problem was in the first place. In the United States, although action research is not a prominent feature in teacher education or public schools, it appears most often in the area of language arts, particularly in studying and developing students' writing skills. In the United Kingdom, action research has a longer, pronounced tradition in teacher education and professional development programs. Lastly, had the institutional context of her work been more learner-centered (for teachers as well as students), Rachel could have pursued an informal collaborative relationship with a colleague in order to study her own practice. This leads us to the next section.

Curriculum as Collaboration

We can envision Rachel in the isolation of her art room, reflecting and acting upon her own curriculum decisions. We can wonder about Rachel's development as an art teacher, with or without the help of a friend. Would Rachel still have a discipline and management problem in December? Would she still find herself unable to teach fifth-grade art, or come to believe she <u>was</u> teaching art even though students weren't learning? Or, would she have worked successfully through this dilemma without assistance? (Research tells us that many beginning teachers

would have left the profession at this point or resorted to overly conservative, unimaginative pedagogy in order to survive.)

The Nature of Collaboration

I believe it helped Rachel to have someone listen and observe her over time, immersed with her and her students in the classroom. It helped that I understood the subject matter Rachel was trying to teach (visual arts) and the complexity of organizing materials and instruction in a media-focused classroom. It helped that I had taught students the same age and hundreds of them per week, with similar constraints. It helped that I had hung around long enough in Rachel's class to know individual students, to be able to ask about them or respond to them as real persons. It helped to have been an artist and teacher to appreciate Rachel's identification with "getting ideas" and the multitude of meanings one could attach to this. Rachel tells me she benefited from someone "mirroring" back her practice with observations, questions, her own answers, field notes, transcripts, and snapshots. She benefited from examining her own beliefs and practice in a climate of trust. Discipline and structuring activities became more manageable after a month or two as we embarked on other important matters: Rachel's goals and objectives regarding art as content, her understanding of students, her pedagogical content knowledge, and trying to figure out what students understood about art as a result of her teaching and their own experiences. I also arranged for Rachel to observe and speak with an experienced art teacher in a nearby district, although she did not pursue this. She seemed stubbornly determined to improve her teaching by pursuing her own ideas and those she and I discussed.

My working with Rachel helped me in terms of having to reconsider the following: What is art? What does it mean to understand, experience, and appreciate art? What does it mean to teach and learn art in schools? What is really possible and why haven't conditions changed for art teachers? How did I learn to teach art? How did I learn how to organize and manage a classroom when no one taught me, either? What kind of teacher was I? How did I make decisions and upon what defensible and "good" grounds did I base my decisions and actions? What did my students really learn in art? Had someone observed and analyzed my practice, would their observations have matched my perceptions? Why or why not?

How articulate was I to others about what children understood and experienced as art? How should a teacher "teach" another teacher? In what ways can teachers learn together in the thicket of practice? Collaboration with Rachel provoked my learning as much as hers.

A dictionary definition of collaborate means "to work jointly with others, especially in an intellectual endeavor" (Woolf, 1977, p. 219). This seems to characterize our relationship and the nature of our work. However, as an "outside" university researcher rather than a fellow teacher, there were built-in risks in our collaborative effort. Our relationship could be perceived as asymmetrical in terms of expertise, status, and interests. The intellectual nature and significance of our work also could be perceived as different, resulting in different kinds of rewards (or the absence of rewards).

Interestingly, to collaborate also means "to cooperate with or willingly assist an enemy..., especially an occupying force, or to cooperate with an agency...with which one is not immediately connected" (Woolf, 1977, p. 219). I could have easily been perceived by Rachel as an "occupying force" in her territory because universities and public schools are loosely connected institutions, despite popular academic rhetoric to the contrary. Unfortunately, most persons in public schools and universities think of theory as located in academe and practice located in the "real world." Likewise, teachers are so accustomed to working in isolation and closing their classroom doors that principals, supervisors, and even school colleagues may be perceived as enemy aliens in one's classroom.

Fortunately, I do not believe that Rachel and I entered into this collaboration with these misconceptions, and if these existed, they were dispelled rather quickly. Rachel was open to and interested in my questions for her own practice: What does it mean to teach art for understanding and what do students understand as art? I was open to Rachel's emerging questions and concerns: What are you seeing in my practice that I don't? Why don't these fifth graders behave and how can I improve this situation so that we can teach and learn in here? We were responsive to each others' questions and maintained a self-reflexive stance with respect to our collaboration. In other words, collaboration requires thoughtful study and monitoring of the collaboration itself by all parties involved as much as it permits the study of other questions or practical endeavors. It requires

educating each other about the questions/efforts at hand and disclosing feelings of perceived relations in the collaborative endeavor. Bolin (1987) refers to collaboration as negotiation. "When one enters into a process where progress or further action depends upon identification of mutual dependence and acknowledgement of conflicting values, one enters into the social and political arena of negotiation" (p. 95).

With or without my interest or help, we can imagine Rachel in late October trying to operate beyond her classroom, perhaps with her specialists/colleagues deliberating and writing a new district-wide art curriculum, participating as the lone arts representative on a schoolwide curriculum committee, in cross-disciplinary team planning and teaching, or presenting a proposal to the school board for more allocation of time and resources to the arts. Such curriculum activities are not unusual, even for first-year teachers. What could Rachel have learned from these kinds of experiences at that time? I suggest much, given Rachel's professional isolation as a specialist and her novice-like approach to teaching. What could others have learned from Rachel and of what value would Rachel's contributions have been to them? I suggest that in October, there would have been little substance or value of Rachel's contributions to collegial deliberation or policy changes.

Even though dialogue with several colleagues might have provoked and surfaced many of Rachel's tacit beliefs (to her benefit) and she might have learned from others, she would have been inarticulate in terms of her own objectives in art, understanding of students, how they learn, and what they can demonstrate successfully as understanding in art. She would have been at a further loss to engage in curriculum deliberation across subjects. As I look back, the chances of Rachel being able to educate her colleagues about art or to defend her own position in October seemed remote. However, by the end of spring term, Rachel had spearheaded a major curriculum revision in her district with little substantive assistance from her art colleagues, negotiated a better schedule and salary for herself, developed and submitted a professional development plan to one of the principals (unfortunately, with little immediate feedback or recognition for her interest in learning), and successfully implemented an art festival that commanded much public attention and commendation. This is not to say that Rachel magically turned into an expert art teacher by spring, but that

she had learned enough about her own teaching and her students' learning through collaborative inquiry and action research to pursue these goals with noticeable success.

Anne and Martha: Talking after School

Let us now turn to two other art teachers, Anne and Martha, deliberating about their curriculum. Both teachers have taught art at all grade levels. Anne, who has been teaching for about five years, is the younger of the two teachers and is assigned to two elementary schools and one middle school. Martha, who has been teaching art for over 20 years, is assigned to two elementary schools, one of which is "shared" with Anne. Although they "share" one school, these two teachers have never spent any time together talking about their curriculum or practice. Mr. Horton, the principal, has told Anne to observe Martha teaching the lower grades and talk with her about the curriculum. He has expressed concern that Anne is not "following the curriculum in a sequential manner." He told her that he has received some complaints from the teachers that she is "teaching over the kids' heads."

Anne: Mr. Horton has told me, "Cover line, line, line, line. Cover shape, shape, shape, shape. Color, color, color. Texture, texture, texture."

Martha: Yeah, but Mr. Horton is not an art person. [Throughout the conversation, Martha tells Anne that Mr. Horton is "probably just trying to be helpful." Later in the conversation, she says, "He understands about the fine arts a little bit, but I don't know if he understands about teaching art."]

Anne: See, my problem with that, Martha, is that I would like to paint lines one day, paint shapes the next day, paint with sponges the next day. You know, I would like to use the materials as paint, paint, paint, charcoal, charcoal, charcoal, and hit on all the concepts that are in our curriculum that way. But he said, "No, go in order." And I said, "What I'm trying to do is hit on as many concepts as possible and use the materials as consistently as possible," which is easier for me doing it from another school if I have all my classes painting that week. That makes a lot more sense to me.

Martha: I think if you explain to him that "I'm emphasizing painting and I'm going paint, paint, paint," then it doesn't matter to him if you're going line, line, line.

Anne: Oh, really?! [seems quite surprised]

Martha: I think maybe that if you explain to him that "I am doing one thing--I'm working through paint, but I'm using different techniques when I'm using paint." I think maybe he thought you were jumping around--I don't know. I don't see where he could say "line, line, line, line...," why he would think that was sequential--

Anne: --He wants me to work sequentially--

Martha: --He looks at our curriculum and thinks we teach line, then shape, then...?

Anne: He wants me to be sequential that way.... See, I would like to mix colors, day one. Day two, maybe object prints with paint. Day three, paint shapes. Day four, paint stencils. Do four different things with paint, talk about..., okay, day one might be hot colors, day two might be cool colors--

Martha: Well, when you talk to him, I think it's very natural--he'll know you're doing something in order, and that you are following some kind of plan--

Anne: Well, I figured he could see that--

Martha: --and not haphazard--

Anne: --with my lesson plans.

It is obvious from the above dialogue that Anne knows art elements and concepts, that these are in the curriculum and are important to teach, and that she probably teaches these concepts. However, like all art teachers, she considers contextual constraints when planning her curriculum. It is much easier to organize the same media and materials for a day or week, moving from class to class and school to school, than it is to vary these much between grade levels and schools per hour, day, or week. If Anne teaches like Martha, she varies the subject matter, focus of the lesson, concepts, techniques, and so on by grade level, even though she might use the same media for all grade levels in a given week or two. Anne also understands, like Martha, that teaching the elements of design (line, shape, pattern, etc.) is embedded in all media and art forms.

Anne: I can cover color and pattern in one lesson and I like to do that. "Okay, let's make an alternating pattern--choose a hot color," write them on the board. "These are the hot colors. And they may feel this way and they look burnt. What else are these colors? Oranges [names warm colors]."

The real crux of Anne's problem emerges: not whether or not she knows and teaches art concepts or teaches these sequentially but that she does not know how to relate the concepts to younger students. She continues.

Anne: "Denny's [restaurant] has orange couches. That's to stimulate your appetite. Color psychologists think that's true." And I joke with the kids about that, and I say, "Who knows, who knows? It's just something to think about." That's what I was telling the older kids. I haven't told the younger kids about Denny's--

Martha: --The young kids would not even know what Denny's is. [Both laugh and Anne picks up on this clue.]

Anne: The other day, I said to the first grade, "Get out your handout." And they said [looks blank and confused].... And so I have to say, "Pick up the picture with the bird" [waving a paper in the air]. "Remember the paper I gave you? Take this out." That is the really hard part for me--figuring out what they need.

Later Anne mentions that Mr. Horton said she ought not use the word "transparent" unless "it is going to be a major feature of that lesson or a major feature of your next lesson." Things continue to click for Anne.

Anne: I'm being too, uh, too [pause]...complex with them. I can tell by talking to you. See, by talking to you, I can tell in what ways I am. Now the "transparent"--that's not a good example. That was just one little isolated thing that I said one time [in second grade], but--

Martha: --I say you can use "transparent" with kids if you make them really thoroughly understand what it means and why you need them to know what it means in this particular case. If you were using cellophane, and you were using it on top of something, and you said this was

"transparent material," well, then you explain why--because you can see through it as opposed to something that wasn't transparent. But, I think if you're talking about transparent paint--watercolor--I'm not sure they're going to understand that. I don't think it'll mean anything to them because to them, it's paint. And it doesn't look--to them--...they can't see through it.

Anne: It's color to them.

Martha: It's color. It's not going to mean anything.

Anne reflects about her lack of experience with primary-level students in her autobiographical experience as well as in teacher preparation. Martha tells Anne that she probably prefers teaching in the upper grades because that is the level in which she did her clinicals and student teaching and also because the middle school and high school schedules allow for more lessons per week, therefore, more continuity lesson to lesson.

Anne: I understand how they [middle school students] think more. I think like a sixth grader. I was thinking about this the other day: "Why do I understand how the older kids think so much better than I understand the little kids?" The little kids really seemed foreign to me when I first got here. I was the youngest by seven years and I never babysat much. I always babysat older kids and I did not hold a baby till I was probably 18. I have not had very much contact with little kids, and it's just very strange for me to say, "Take out your handout," and they go [stares blankly]. You know, they don't understand.

Anne continues by saying she's "read her Lowenfeld" (an art education text focused heavily on student development and expressivity, which Martha has suggested she reread). "But I still can't know by doing that. I have to know by talking to people like you, and by doing it myself, and by making mistakes, by figuring it out from there. I think that's really how I'm going to learn this stuff." After observing Martha teach a first-grade class and taking copious notes, their conversation continues:

Anne: You explain stuff a lot less than I do. You say, like, uh [pause, searching through notes].... It was only four words long [pause]. I wrote down what I would've said, and it would have been about 7 or 10

words long.... Somebody said, "I didn't get a brush." And you said, "It's coming. It's coming." I would have said, "Well, you have to wait. They're being passed out. Jenny's passing them out. You're going to get two different ones, remember? And we're going...." See? I feel like I have to explain everything. I overexplain stuff that I don't need to overexplain. That's good [that I figured this out] because that gets too much attention, time, and energy....

What Anne perhaps missed from this brief observation is how organized and consistent Martha is week to week, month to month and, apprarently, year to year. After observing Martha for weeks, I noticed how much (and how well) students understood and remembered procedures, techniques, terms, and topics, even from kindergarten, which required little reteaching--therefore, time. Rather than a designated art room, Martha teaches art in each classroom with an art cart. Yet, no matter how messy a project, distribution of materials and clean-up, together, never take more than 10 minutes of her hour with students. Procedures, responsibilities, and locations of various materials (i.e., paper will always be put in two places on the floor) are so well-understood by students that often, all Martha has to do is point in a particular direction with a smile.

The "wisdom of practice" (and lack of it) comes through in Anne and Martha's final remarks about discourse with students. Martha says she tries to help students think they thought of it (an idea, concept, term), rather than telling them everything. "Oh, that's a wonderful way to put that," or "I'm glad you thought of that."

Martha: You know, you were hoping all along one of the kids would [come up with the term, idea, or concept]. That's why you had them into it to begin with.

Anne: Sometimes I say, "Wow, you're the only one that figured it out so far" [seemingly pleased with herself and confident in this tactic].

Martha: Yeah, you're the only smart one in the class...and you're all dumb!" [said rapidly].

Martha's last statement was said mockingly, but the sarcasm in how it was uttered suggested that Martha thought Anne's form of praise was

inappropriate. Such a remark "sets up" kids competitively and is a poor way to reward a student's response: at the expense of others. Because it was said jokingly and little more was said about rewarding students' responses, Anne may have missed the point.

Some of Martha's "wisdom of practice" was shared in this one-hour conversation with respect to Anne's surge of questions and concerns: establishing communication and positive relations with classroom teachers and principals by being informative, confident, organized, and firm; trying to figure out individual teachers' classroom rules and modus operandi to "fit in," not to upset teachers or confuse students but to establish your own rules so you can teach art; having difficulties being "the new kid on the block" and following Martha's reputation; having persons misunderstand what it is you are teaching when they only glimpse two minutes of a lesson (i.e., using the word "transparent"); having other teachers judge your performance when they are illiterate with respect to art ("Aren't leaves supposed to be green?"); not being able to get copies of invoices at another school to figure out why you are in the red and why you cannot order half of the supplies you planned to use this year, when you suspect money is being funneled into other school programs.

Anne and Martha considered all of Schwab's (1962) curriculum "commonplaces" in their brief conversation: subject matter, learner, teacher, and milieu/context. They attended most to learners and context because these were the concerns which Anne brought to the deliberation. However, like many art teachers I have observed, they focused a great deal on contextual constraints like structuring and organizing materials and procedures for learning, techniques in manipulating art media, and the political features of being a specialist/itinerant. Beyond using media to make products, it remains unclear as to <u>why</u> they teach (or do not teach) art concepts such as the elements of design, what counts as an important understanding in art, and why they feel it is important for students to manipulate various media like paint, clay, or paper to make people and animals. Most art curriculum guides are organized around media, elements of design, and subject matter (like people, animals), but the logic and rationale for this particular selection and organization remain unclear. There are tacit assumptions embedded in curriculum documents as well as in practice. Bolin (1987) reminds us:

> The teacher's tacit belief about how to proceed in the face of conflict could be to give and take or informally negotiate a consensus settlement that allows for personal action and interpretation, but which meets requirements of follow-through in order to "keep the peace" and avoid conflict. Both of these tacit assumptions--those written into the curriculum document and those held by the teacher--influence implementation. (p. 95)

Further, all the art teachers I have observed plan quite flexibly, penciling in their calendars no more than a week or two in advance. Although they may be required by some administrators to write long-term lesson plans and have an idea about what media, art forms, and concepts they will cover in the year, art teachers plan more interactively in the short term than they do prescriptively in the long term. Many specialists also briefly record what was accomplished (or not) in a lesson for a given class and pencil in or revise next week's calendar box, defining where to "pick up" and what to move on to or elaborate. Martha advised Anne, "Things work differently [than planned]. Sometimes we finish and sometimes we don't. Sometimes one thing naturally leads to another thing that I didn't even think about when I teach a lesson. I want to go with the interests of the children."

Martha asked fifth graders to vote on what medium they wished to pursue next (clay) and acted on their vote. However, she knew full well that students' wishes would fit into the existing art curriculum and realm of possibilities. Like many art teachers, for Martha, clay is a possible medium to use any time after the beginning of the year and after reestablishing expectations and routines with more manageable materials and activities like drawing. She also told Anne that now that the first graders' clay sculptures were completed, she would introduce "pattern" the following week, with students stamping patterns for wrapping paper. Students already were familiar with the paint medium and how to use it. Thus, Martha reduced the number of variables for the following lesson in such a way that pattern could be the primary focus of the lesson--not handling the paint medium or stamping. The paper designs would be used to wrap the clay sculptures for students to take home as gifts. Thus, Martha linked one art form and experience to another in a meaningful way

for students. The point is, in September, Martha did not know she would follow a unit on clay (three-dimensional form) with painting (focused on pattern and design). She thought of this while firing the clay sculptures and considering the school and seasonal calendar.

Some art teachers, more than others, are sensitive to the rhythms of the school year and seasons in their planning. For example, Martha's wrapping paper lesson on pattern and design arrived near the Thanksgiving holiday. Thus, she told me that she could avoid religious controversy (had this lesson occurred near the Christmas holiday) as well as stereotyped "turkey topics," which she knew most classroom teachers would cover in abundance. In the short Thanksgiving week, Martha avoided introducing a new, in-depth unit in art with some students missing important art sessions, there being a large gap between lessons, and grade-level groups being "out of sync" with each other until the next holiday. Rachel, on the other hand, paid little attention to the school calendar or season, despite students' sensitivity to such. When not finishing their paper bag masks one week, a second grader said, "But next week is November first." Rachel responded without clarification, "That's okay. I don't see what that has to do with your masks." The student's point was Halloween would have come and gone, and had students planned to wear their handmade masks for Halloween, these students would be without theirs.

In the school shared by Anne and Martha, the student body was small but incredibly diverse in world cultures represented. However, there was little attention to the cultural, critical, and historical dimensions of art in Martha's class. The absence of "evaluation" came up in the conversation between Martha and Anne as it did in Rachel's. From her classroom observation, Anne noticed that Martha did not "get to evaluation either." Both lamented "never having time," but Martha also questioned the value of doing this at the elementary level--at least in terms of having a designated lesson segment called "evaluation." Unbenownst to Anne, Martha decided to focus on "techniques" for the last couple of years because "flex time" and interdisciplinary planning and teaching (which she enjoyed so much and found meaningful for both student and teacher learning) were voted down by classroom teachers in favor of their getting a guaranteed, one-hour planning time. Thus, the specialists were now called "relief teachers,"

working in factory-like one-hour periods, room to room, school to school. There was no more collaborative planning and teaching between specialists and classroom teachers, even though Martha appreciated elementary teachers' need to have planning time.

Another complex feature of art teachers' collaboration is the language they use. If teachers do not work or talk together often, there is little shared language or understanding about terms, concepts, and meanings attached to art and the teaching and learning of art. Absence of a shared language creates all kinds of barriers to teachers' learning from each other and their developing a collective understanding of curriculum documents and practice. Ultimately, one must wonder what students learn or understand about art when there is little professional dialogue among those who teach them.

One example of confusion was the deliberation over the meaning of "sequence" as viewed by Martha, Anne, and Mr. Horton. Understanding "sequence" relied on a shared understanding of worthwhile art content and concepts, and how and when to present these to students. There seemed to be little shared understanding in this regard, even among the specialists. Rachel viewed "evaluation" or "criticism" as procedural knowledge. Anne viewed "evaluation" as the incorporation of a lesson segment, a kind of academic exercise that attended to the aesthetic and design features of the products that students had created. Martha understood "evaluation" as a potential, isolated lesson segment occurring at the end of the lesson, too, but she also interpreted evaluation as an activity or skill embedded throughout a lesson in which students learn to engage in independently, in light of a lesson's primary objectives or tasks. After a fifth-grade class observation, Martha shared the following with me:

> I don't get too many kids anymore who say, "I can't" because I think they know whatever they do is accepted.... There are still some kids [new students to the school, therefore, to Martha's expectations] saying, "Is this good?" The other kids know I will never answer that question. I'll say, "What is it that we were trying to do?" Then I make them tell me and I say, "Do you think you accomplished it?" I won't say, "Yeah, that's good or that's bad." They used to tell me what the problem was, and see if they'd solved it, and then they can make up their minds. I let them evaluate.

In the beginning of the year, Rachel totally ignored this sort of evaluation--even as a structural or procedural device. Even the "task" or problem-solving features of making art remained unknown to students because Rachel's objectives were unclear--even to herself, sample product outcomes were not shown for fear that students would copy the examples presented to them and not "get their own ideas," and procedures/ techniques related to the use of the media at hand were ignored. It seems that if an elementary art curriculum focuses primarily on media exposure and the making of art objects, then the procedural, problem-finding, and problem-solving features of making art and evaluating the process, strengths/limitations of the media, and product outcomes should not be ignored.

There are two kinds of collaboration presented in this section as curriculum deliberation: (a) informal professional talk among colleagues focused on developing and sharing "the wisdom of practice," "tools of the trade," and pedagogical problem solving (Rachel and I conversing in a restaurant); and (b) more formal professional talk instigated by someone external or peripheral to the actual teaching of art (i.e., the principal supervising Anne by interpreting the written art curriculum for her, misinterpreting her practical problem, and requesting she observe and/or collaborate with Martha to solve this problem).

Because of selectively presenting excerpts, what the reader may have missed in the dialogue between Anne and Martha is their power struggle over voice and definition of expertise. The actual transcript is replete with both teachers talking at the same time and interrupting each other, neither listening very well to the other's concerns or advice. Some of this struggle may have been due to their not having talked together previously, thus, little professional trust had been established between them. It also may have been due to the principal's intervention, putting Anne more on the defensive than Martha. Anne genuinely had to struggle to interject what and why she did things the way she did. Further, Martha did not seem particularly interested in what or how Anne taught beyond what she perceived to be the immediate problem: relating to primary-level students.

After the conversation between Martha and Ann, Martha told me that she was "tired of teaching other art teachers what they should have learned in college" or through "common sense" and experience. She was

"tired of playing art supervisor" when none existed any longer after the district's budget cuts, and she admitted "maybe I'm getting burned out." "I've seen so many things come and go," Martha reflected: "I just can't get too excited or enthusiastic about bandwagons anymore." While Martha warmed somewhat toward Anne as their conversation progressed, she really was not all that interested in learning from Anne. As far as Martha was concerned, Anne had little knowledge or expertise to offer her. Anne persisted quite diplomatically and tactfully, nevertheless, with frequent compliments such as "That's a good idea," "I really admire what you do," and "I'm being too complex with them. I can tell by talking to you." Martha did not acknowledge these compliments nor compliment Anne for her ideas and efforts. Anne was bursting with questions. She seemed to want to test her ideas against Martha's wisdom and expertise, turning the principal's negative criticism into a more positive opportunity to learn and share than some teachers might have been able to muster under similar circumstances, but Martha rarely let Anne complete an example or statement. Neither teacher negatively carped about the principal's intervention or lack of content knowledge when they could have diverted constructive talk in this unprofessional and unproductive direction.

Given the circumstances and "feel" of this conversation, I doubt that Anne will seek Martha's advice again, unless the principal remains dissatisfied with Anne's performance. Given Martha's feelings about mentoring other art teachers, I doubt that she will ask Anne how she is getting along or instigate assistance or advice in the future. I doubt that she will intervene on Anne's behalf with the principal because she expressed little respect for either person, particularly Mr. Horton's leadership, vision, communication, or support for teachers (regular or specialists), and his understanding of the needs of elementary teachers and students. Itinerant specialists roving school to school have the knowledge and experience to compare school contexts, leadership styles, and professional climate. Further, what may work well for them in one setting may not work well for them in another. Both Ann and Martha experienced this, but they handled this tension in different ways and with different degrees of success.

Collegial discourse and collaboration, however, can work effectively, particularly when this is initiated informally among teachers in a climate

of trust and shared expertise, with interest in ends greater than those of an individual teacher. For example, in another case study (May, in press), three elementary music specialists decided (on their own) to meet in two-hour planning blocks on Thursday afternoons after school. Of particular interest to these specialists was the horizontal and vertical articulation of their music curriculum. Each of these teachers was responsible for teaching approximately 1,100 students per week in 30-minute lessons. They wanted to be within reasonable agreement on what they were teaching by grade level and school in terms of what they called a "coherent and defensible" elementary music program. They agreed on using the same one-page lesson-plan form devised and revised over time by one of the teachers. It included vocal warm-ups (goal, song, pitch matching/reading, and attendance), music concept (both performing and creating), and a listening lesson segment (name of music, composer/performer, lesson goal, teaching sequence).

Like the art specialists, these teachers worked flexibly with written plans, using these as much as a record of what actually was presented or covered as a plan for future lessons. However, they were more explicit about what they planned to cover. They drew upon each others' strengths and expertise, sharing these during the planning sessions and photocopying resources, music, and lesson plans for each other. Each admitted being weak or less interested in a particular area of the music curriculum and actively drew upon the strengths and interests of their colleagues for ideas. Esther was expert in developing creative call charts (visual material that helps students map the structure or "story" of a musical piece as they listen to it), student improvisation, and conceiving of "higher order" thinking skills or activities that challenged youngsters to apply what they were learning in creative ways. Marilyn was expert in movement ideas to accompany singing, drawing from diverse musical literature, and keeping the group of music teachers on-task without coercion. Roberta was resourceful in acquiring musical instruments for students' firsthand examination, musical videotapes from the public library, and linking opportunities for talented middle school students to work with her elementary students. While trying to standardize to some degree by publishing their lesson plans for each other and discussing these,

these teachers acknowledged the need to maintain flexibility as individuals and as a group.

Marilyn: Esther, I used your outlines for lesson plans. Did you give one of these to Roberta?

Esther: Yes, I think I sent--

Roberta: I got it. It came in the mail this morning.

Marilyn: It is looking kinda good now. I really like that outline.

Roberta: Yeah.

Marilyn: We'll tend to stay with a pattern better, if we always follow the same one--but we do not always have to do all that stuff--

Esther: Right, you're not going to cover everything in here. I've found some weeks I would even skip major sections.

All agree that they cannot always "get to everything." However, the important point is that these teachers monitor what they cover and omit; they discuss what the trade-offs were and why; they talk about what students found problematic and enjoyable; and they agree to "refocus" (individually and collectively) the following week(s) in a way that maintains a delicate balance over the long run. They discuss which musical selections and activities best help students understand musical concepts and appreciate diverse musical forms and activities. According to Schwab's (1962) curriculum "commonplaces," these teachers focus heavily on subject matter and learners (age-appropriate learning, student interests/responses), and then fairly evenly on the teacher (teachers' knowledge and strategies), and milieu. There is little reference to contextual constraints. An analysis of audio transcripts of the planning sessions for a semester revealed the following persistent topics of professional talk:

> Horizontal planning (synchronizing by grade level and across teachers in terms of concepts and activities covered/to be covered; sharing and often revising expectations for students by grade level, usually in the direction of higher expectations)
>
> Vertical planning (consideration of what was/should be presented at which grade level or year and why; what deserves reviewing from the previous semester or year or not; linking students' instrumental experiences from one year to the next through systematic

presentation of underlying musical concepts rather than mere development of technical skills)

Links and transitions (week-to-week concept development, linking instruction to students' likely prior experiences and nonschool experiences with music; linking musical literature cumulatively to develop students' repertoires for listening as well as performing)

Coverage and balance ("I didn't get to that yet but will next week"; "Which instruments have you introduced in grade two?" "This is taking them longer to understand than I thought it would. I'm going to continue this next week"; "Students generally love listening lessons if there is enough repeated exposure to a piece and different things to do with it or listen for.")

Merging academic musical learning and concept development into intrusive vernacular expectations (parsimonious use of seasonal, holiday, or popular songs; school concerts; judging the selection of "fun" songs and activities for their overall musical merit)

Management and organization (discipline; efficient organization and distribution of materials; organizing students for different activities in a lesson with the least amount of disruption or confusion; how to acquire/use resources and supplies)

Sharing resources (lesson plans duplicated for reference and flexibility, but not for mimicking or rigid standardization; sharing and assuming responsibilities such as, "I'll call him and order our recorders" or "I'll make copies of that for you.")

Teaching each other (demonstrating movements to each other, teaching lyrics, hand signals, strategies; "Show me how you did that," "How did you present that to the kids?" or "How can I help them understand X? That's so hard, in my opinion!")

Autobiographical references (what one remembers learning or experiencing as a young learner; references to community activities such as choir practice or attending concerts; one teacher's "Jeremy" stories--references to her five-year-old son and how she gauges what kindergartners will understand, tolerate, or enjoy)

Contextual dilemmas (being ousted out of one's music room so that sausage and cheese may be stored there for fundraising or voting booths can be temporarily installed; substitutes who do not follow carefully designed lesson plans)

Much is at stake for Esther, Marilyn, and Roberta. Only two years earlier did their district and community agree to hire music specialists.

They are off on the right foot, it seems. By deliberating in this way, there is little dissension or confusion in terms of what this district's (or an individual school's) music program is about. What has been accomplished or learned and what is to be learned are well understood by these teachers because of their frequent deliberations, and these understandings are easily communicated to parents, principals, and other teachers. Although these specialists have a back-breaking schedule and pupil-teacher ratio, belong to a union that does not support their need and right to be compensated for this intensive and thoughtful planning time, and they work in contexts that displace them from their music rooms to store sausage and cheese, they have established a firm, professional base from which to argue for more reasonable conditions for teaching and learning in the future. They have at least six legs to stand on, and they have made public to themselves and others what learning means in music.

While these teachers created their own professional forum for deliberation, other teachers create more informal professional contacts. For example, in one of my studies (May, 1985), a couple of the art teachers on an elementary staff developed a close friendship and called each other in the evenings to address questions and issues similar to those of the music specialists above. However, the fruit of their thinking and labor was less visible to their colleagues and supervisor than for the music specialists. Two other art teachers were involved in community arts activities which helped them feel less professionally isolated as artists and less mired in school routines. Several of these teachers spoke of their need to engage in artistic discourse and activities with adults--not only with youngsters.

Like other professionals, teachers need opportunities to engage in professional discourse and activities with their peers; otherwise, they may resort to collecting superficial ideas from magazines like recipes. In doing so, they are not engaged in active constructive learning. They are not true "conceptualizers" of their own goals and work nor do they have to make their ideas public and test these against supportive, but critical colleagues. Thoughtful and able teachers relish addressing the "why" questions behind their "what," "when," and "how-to" decisions. This becomes an even more provocative activity in the company of peers engaged in similar theoretical interests. I know of two groups of teachers who formed their own weekly "study groups" at a nearby university. Someone like Rachel would have

benefited greatly from becoming a part of planning sessions like those of the music teachers, had such existed for art teachers in her district. This professional structure was established by the teachers themselves for the benefit of each other as well as their learners. Teachers like Marilyn, Esther, and Roberta would have worked supportively to help someone like Rachel or Anne identify, develop, and share their talents and tackle their problems.

Much can be accomplished in curriculum development and professional development efforts when there is an institutional expectation that teachers can and will engage in and benefit from professional discourse of their own making and concerns, and when there is adequate quality time for teachers to engage in thoughtful deliberation beyond the teacher's lounge or ubiquitous faculty meeting. This leads us to the final section of this paper.

Curriculum Deliberation in Larger Institutional Contexts

Schools, districts, and universities are sociopolitical, institutional arenas where collective decisions must be made and acted upon in the interest of educating ourselves and others. As I have argued elsewhere (May, 1989), the construction of art knowledge and efforts to reform curriculum or practice must acknowledge these arenas and address the persistent constraints that impinge upon our work. In academe and teacher preparation programs, we cannot expect to educate knowledgeable and reflective art teachers if the opportunities provided them in the university through liberal arts preparation, program focus, content, coursework, field experiences, and our own pedagogy do not reflect what we wish teachers to emulate and be able to do themselves upon graduation and throughout their careers. We might adopt the amenable notions of "portfolio" and collaboration to assist preservice teachers in documenting and assessing their knowledge, thoughts, activities, and professional development over time related to teaching and learning art. With regard to Rachel's complaint, we must make our work distinguishable from the efforts of nonspecialists and more concrete, visible, and explicit to beginning art teachers.

We could revisit Schwab's (1962) commonplaces and reassess the balance and attention we give to subject matter, learners, teacher, and milieu

in our teacher preparation programs. We might ask ourselves if we forward a particular view about each of the above over viable alternative viewpoints, why, and how we can justify our particular emphases to future teachers. Or, we might use Huebner's (1966) five ways of valuing educational realities to examine the values we proffer in programs and practice, whether in academe or staff development efforts in public schools. Atkins (1986) used Huebner's value interests to frame part of her analysis of college-level curriculum deliberations: (1) technical (employing a means-ends rationality, measured mastery, stating objectives in behavioral terms); (2) political (looking for ways that peer, community, and administrative support is taken into consideration); (3) scientific (efforts to find out more about what we have learned from research related to teaching and learning in general, and in relation to the arts in particular); (4) aesthetic (if and how a search for beauty, integrity, form, and learning for learning's sake pervade deliberations); and (5) ethical (how relationships between persons in the deliberative and teaching-learning processes are perceived and valued).

We might reconsider research in adult development and teacher education to decide upon a rationale for program content and the sequencing of experiences. If many preservice and beginning teachers are concerned about management and discipline, what does this imply we ought to teach about this, when, how, and where? Professional development must grow from the needs and concerns of teachers (Hall & Hord, 1987; Hall & Loucks, 1979) and provide opportunities for inquiry for the purpose of self-improvement (Berlak & Berlak, 1981; Tikunoff & Mergendollar, 1983). If many art teachers are legitimately concerned about the contextual constraints of their work, no matter their years of experience, how can we help them address these constraints constructively through networking and active negotiation with others? Most current staff development programs focus on "correcting teacher deficits" rather than on the growth of teachers (Howey & Vaughn, 1983). With respect to developmental issues and research on beginning teachers, in my case studies I have found it difficult to define what constitutes a "beginning" teacher or "expert" teacher in terms of their concerns or perceived problems. For example, Rachel had four-to-five years of K-12 art teaching experience, but the quality and location of her preservice and teaching

experiences were neither sustained nor amenable to professional development. Rather than assume teachers' needs by their years of experience, it is better to ask teachers what they perceive their needs to be and to explore these with them as well as the nature of their experiences (both as learners and teachers), which informs their beliefs and practice.

If many art teachers cannot tell you <u>why</u> it is important for students to learn about the elements of design, why they have a media-focused curriculum, or why they have chosen certain exemplars of art to show youngsters and not others, what do art teachers need to know, see, and experience themselves as learners? If many art teachers are isolated professionally, how can we build a community of professional learners, beginning with our own preparation programs and continuing through mentoring and staff development in the field? In one case study (May, 1985), an art teacher suggested she would like to have "more inservice training by artists and art educators to broaden my horizons and make teaching more interesting and stimulating to myself and the students" (p. 119). Another desired "time off for art teachers to attend art-related conventions or a planned group trip to the local art museum--a half-day off to do things together." How can we help teachers learn to reflect and talk seriously about the significance of their practice beyond recipe clipping and complaints about constraints? How can we help them identify salient features and events observed in practice or from the perspective of the youngsters in their classrooms?

In preparation programs, students could actively participate in departmental planning and program development or evaluation: This is curriculum deliberation in action, par excellence, and it is related directly to participants' shared, lived context of teaching and learning. A more daring structure would include experienced teachers in these deliberations and the joint education of new teachers within both university and public school settings. At Michigan State University, several professors teach youngsters part time, five days a week, in public schools and collaborate with their classroom teachers. Most of these researcher/teachers are studying their own pedagogical content knowledge in a particular subject area such as math, science, or history, and they are trying to figure out better ways to develop students' understanding of these subjects. Teachers (no matter their location) could learn to plan together, critique each others'

plans, observe and respond to each others' teaching, and engage in case studies of teaching and learning through well-developed protocols or real cases. In short, in teacher education programs and staff development, we must publicly consider and model all those ideas and strategies we ask teachers to consider in their curriculum deliberations, be these private or collaborative in nature. We have the capacity and expertise to provide a variety of conceptual frameworks and tools which teachers can use to critically analyze disciplinary knowledge or subject matter, professional discourse, university and school practice, leadership, collaboration, curriculum documents, professional development, and student learning. In order to do this convincingly and effectively, we must first be conscientious students of our own practice, much like Dewey forwarded in 1904.

Some existing art staff meeting arrangements and structures fall short of possibilities in terms of professional development and curriculum deliberation. In a two-year case study (May, 1985), 10 art teachers met with their supervisor weekly on Monday mornings, 8:30-9:30. This time was selected because most principals did not want art taught on Monday morning, viewing this time vital for reading, math, and students' attention. The same can be said for art teachers' attention. Although these staff meetings were relatively pleasant and businesslike, almost everyone but the supervisor seemed withdrawn, preoccupied, and pressed to get on with their week. Some teachers dribbled in late, others rummaged through available supplies after the meeting had begun or before it ended, and some left early. The supervisor spent over half of this hour making announcements (upcoming exhibits, status of supply orders) and passing out forms (travel vouchers, medical forms, advertisements). The last portion of this hour was designated for a teacher to "present"--usually with only about five minutes left for this presentation.

The teacher assigned on the calendar "presented" an overview of one of his/her lessons, examples of students' work, explained procedures, and evaluated the success of the lesson. If there was time left for discussion (which was rare), teachers appeared more animated and contributed potential solutions to any problems that were shared. Teachers told me that the most meaningful part of weekly staff meetings was "presenting." They wanted more dialogue to "share ideas," "to see how other teachers do

things," and address their practical concerns. Ears seemed to perk and eyes riveted to the "presenter" of the week.

In the last staff meeting of the first academic year in the above study, the art supervisor attempted to have teachers review and revise the "curriculum agreements list," a one-page statement of what media, art forms, and subject matter would be introduced at the third- and fourth-grade levels to avoid redundancy between the two grades. (I discovered that revisions had not been made in the written curriculum for five years.) The meeting stalemated on media and art forms. The only accomplishment in this meeting was the crossing out of "intaglio/etching on Plexiglass" and an attempt to develop a new list of media parameters or art forms (drawing, textiles, painting, printing, three-dimensional, and collage). A disagreement ensued related to three-dimensional and two-dimensional art. "Wasn't weaving in textiles three-dimensional?" someone asked. Confusion and grumbling set in. The supervisor appointed a subcommittee to revise the agreement, but to my knowledge they never met, and there was no resolution on this for the following academic year. Again, teachers were not dealing with significant art concepts, goals, and those understandings about art they wanted students to develop. They were not discussing age appropriateness as a criterion for content selection and organization. The teachers were barely able to talk about media and art forms, much less the bigger "why" questions.

The teachers in the above case study were not accustomed to talking about curriculum and instructional matters, despite having weekly staff meetings. At the end of the first year, I reported some of my concerns about curriculum repetition and omission from grade level to grade level, particularly for shifts in student populations to feeder schools. I gave some examples of identical lessons from year to year, and one teacher exclaimed, "I don't think it hurts a kid if he does something two times in a row. Kids need practice." "You want them to do tissue-paper clown faces two years in a row...when they only get a semester of art a year, or about 12 art lessons total?" I responded. I turned the problem around and asked, "How about what they may not get over two years then?" To my dismay, the supervisor (I suspect somewhat embarrassed) then requested that the teachers reconstruct their entire academic year of lesson plans before the summer break! Unless teachers had kept a record in their planbooks (like the music

specialists), this obviously would have been extremely difficult and time-consuming to reconstruct at this late date. It was the end of the school year, teachers had just matted hundreds of students' work, hung three exhibits, and participated in a large city arts festival staffing "art booths." To my knowledge, the teachers did not/could not fulfill this unreasonable request.

Schiffer (1979) reminds us that many staff development and school or curriculum improvement efforts have not been effective because of many factors. She surmises that inadequate staff development models have one or more of the following shortcomings:

> (1) They are biased toward fulfilling organizational goals through the use of rational change strategies; thus, they fail to adequately take into account the behavioral regularities and values that exist in the school and overlook the need to make attitudinal and normative changes.
>
> (2) They are biased toward making personal change and do not make sufficient provision for organizational accommodation to these changes.
>
> (3) They are based on unrealistic assumptions about authority prerogatives; thus, they do not adequately deal with the political question of <u>who</u> makes <u>what</u> decisions and <u>how</u>. (pp. 4-5)

An example of the first shortcoming would be a district-level mandate that all art teachers will teach these four content areas equitably: production, aesthetics, history, and criticism. Art teachers value student production of art objects through a variety of media and only occasionally include history or criticism in their lessons. While some may see the value of teaching these four areas to students, they also know that students, parents, administrators, and classroom teachers do not expect nor understand the value of this additional content. Isn't art about making stuff? Doesn't it have to do with something called "creative expression"? Isn't it a legitimate and deserved relief from "the basics"? Another example of this shortcoming would be the unrealistic expectation that teachers can write or revise a curriculum document in one after-school session or in a half-day inservice, or that they could reconstruct a year's

worth of lessons. Even if teachers had written lesson plans, what actually was taught may not have been recorded nor reflected as revisions on these lesson plans. Thus, any reconstructed report would not be an accurate reflection of what was presented. Further, accounting for what was presented or covered does not reflect what students may have actually been taught or learned (or not). All of these examples reflect "rational" organizational goals and strategies and the persistent belief that teaching and learning mean presenting and covering. These notions do not match teachers' practical curriculum decisions and realities.

An example of the second shortcoming, in which improvement efforts focus on making personal changes with little institutional support, would be my expecting all teachers to be reflective students of their own practice without providing adequate time, flexible scheduling, teaming arrangements, cross-school observation and consultation, or reward structures for teachers to engage in thoughtful planning, inquiry, and collaboration. In this case, I am expecting teachers to grow personally and professionally without any tangible support, changes in school organization, or restructuring teachers' duties and time to their professional benefit.

An example of the third shortcoming related to unrealistic assumptions about authority perogatives would be Mr. Horton deciding what the art curriculum is, how art should be taught, and mandating that Anne and Martha teach according to his conception, even though they are the art experts and he isn't. He also could insist they devise end-of-year tests to demonstrate student achievement, as may be required in other subjects, even though Anne and Martha may have other defensible forms of student evaluation in place. The example of the music specialists' weekly deliberations appropriately locates power and expertise, but these teachers were not rewarded with designated planning time like that afforded other teachers and had to deliberate "out of hide" and personal conviction (the second shortcoming). Further, the union demonstrated little interest or concern for specialists' constraints in the case of the music specialists as well as the art teachers. While federal regulations help shape the parameters and work of special education teachers, art specialists have no one defining or negotiating working conditions on their behalf. They

seemingly have less power than classroom teachers to change policies which directly affect them and their students' learning.

Determining which approach to curriculum and staff development we wish to take depends foremost on our values and epistemological orientation, particularly our conception of a "good" teacher and what it means to teach and learn. May and Zimpher (1986) explored three paradigms of supervision from a social science perspective, drawing from the work of Habermas's (1971) three human interests: technical/scientific, practical/communicative, and critical/emancipatory. Similarly, Zimpher and Howey (1987) developed a framework for examining four types of teacher competence and approaches to supervision related to these competencies: (1) technical skills (mastering preconceived methods of instruction such as Madeline Hunter's model); (2) clinical (involving practical reasoning and problem solving; (3) personal (understanding of self and multiple perspectives with expertise in interpretive capacities in interpersonal relations); and (4) critical (the disposition to engage in social critique and reconstruction of repressive practices).

As with most persons who categorize, we end up saying that eclecticism or all competencies are needed in teaching as long as one interest is not emphasized over others. Categorizing is most helpful, it seems, when such thinking assists our hearing and better comprehending teachers' individual concerns and contexts, for example: being able to hear and respond to Rachel's concerns about management and discipline rather than forcing other topics and issues into her inquiry prematurely; or being able to witness and appreciate music specialists moving adroitly among all of the above "commonplaces" while on the verge of critical praxis (their being near a moment to politically reconstruct and negotiate their working conditions); or better understanding the natural tensions that can exist between teachers in curriculum deliberation when collegial discourse has no history, trust has not been established, and specialists do not share a common language.

All of this implies that a major curriculum reform, such as initiating the rewriting of a curriculum document from "above" with a handful of teachers, will not be meaningful nor effective if the teachers themselves did not stumble over some perceived discrepancy between "what is" and "what ought to be." Teachers care most about their practice, not

about writing curriculum documents. Developing a shared rationale, goals, and objectives in a curriculum document is a difficult thing to do if there has been no previous, intensive, and sustained collegial talk and collaboration. If few teachers have a shared understanding of "what is," it is all the more difficult for them to imagine what ought to be and what is possible.

One of the most enlightening ways teachers, supervisors, and researchers can identify a discrepancy or a desired direction of change in a particular context is to engage in extended inquiry focused only on "what is." Guiding questions for such inquiry might be, "What does it mean to know and teach art?" "What do my fourth-grade students understand and experience as art?" "What are students learning by grade level, or what are they apt to learn about art as they progress from grade to grade?" "In what ways do I change my lesson plans when I teach, and how can I document the nature of these changes?" "What do my kids really mean when they refer to art objects as 'totally rad,' 'far out,' 'weird,' 'junk,' 'neat,' 'good,' 'like my Grandma's'?" "What kinds of questions can I ask to help students express their meaning of these terms more fully so that I can respond to them more meaningfully?"

There are excellent, teacher-friendly resources available to educators who are about to embark on such dialogue and inquiry together. Bolin and Falk's (1987) collection of essays helps teachers reconsider the nature of teaching and the complexity and diversity of their decisions. Connelly and Clandinin (1988) introduce teachers to the idea of personal practical knowledge and tools/resources for reflection, curriculum deliberation, and action on a very personal basis. Brubaker (1982) and Walker (1990) focus on interpersonal relations and the art of curriculum deliberation which would be helpful for a group or committee. And while I do not agree with many of Glatthorn's (1987) tenets about creating a "mastery curriculum" (teaching only the "needs to know" and not the "nice to know"), several of his chapters present clear examples of the nuts and bolts of doing needs assessments, selecting and organizing what to teach, and writing curriculum at various levels (lessons, units, courses, and programs).

Data collection, analyses, and dialogue focused on this sort of inquiry almost always is illuminating to all and replete with surprises. In one case study (May, 1985), third graders felt more positive about their performance

in art class than their art teachers speculated the students would say. Students rated their performance as "terrific" or "very good" (38% and 25%), while 80% of the art teachers felt that students would rate their own performance as only "okay." This finding provoked much discussion among the teachers, as did those related to students' expressed resistance to copying predefined teacher examples or their definitions of "realistic" in relation to the academic definitions presented by teachers. Teachers also discovered that because of busing patterns and not discussing their lessons by grade level or school, some students were getting the exact same lessons from one year to the next (same medium, subject matter, concepts, and technique, i.e., tissue-paper clown faces). Students certainly were aware of this unnecessary repetition. Some also were aware that they had had no opportunities to work with clay and other three-dimensional materials over a four-year period when entering middle school art classes.

With an extensive, practical knowledge base developed from local inquiry, what "ought to be" is more easily deliberated. Teachers will have spent a semester or year examining their own beliefs and practices and those of colleagues, developing trust and interpersonal skills, reading and critiquing ideas from professional literature, and they will have had a better opportunity to locate and examine problems and issues that need to be addressed individually and collectively. Thus, the direction, degree, and focus of curriculum reform is grounded in practical and theoretical inquiry in local context. University personnel and supervisors could help teachers explore modes, methods, and tools of inquiry and action research to help teachers address their questions. Finally, collaboration and inquiry need not be an isolated, discipline-based affair. Specialists and classroom teachers can collaborate on interdisciplinary endeavors or document student learning and dispositions across subjects. If art specialists are ever to become more integral in a school's goals and curriculum, and are to better educate peers and parents (as well as themselves) about the significance of arts learning, they need to become more engaged in school-based dialogue and change efforts.

Art teachers already are curriculum developers in their private deliberations. Some are more thoughtful and reflective than others. Some manage to develop well-articulated professional goals for themselves and work arduously toward these; others simply try to survive in a climate that

neither urges nor supports professional development and lifelong learning. To become more reflective and critically engaged, however, practitioners need time and space for dialogue and collaboration to bring personal beliefs and practices to the foreground for examination. What emerges is a kind of evolving, collective statement or shared understanding about art, what it means to teach and learn art, and why art is deemed worthwhile for youngsters to experience in public schools. This requires understanding one's own personal practical knowledge, developing collegial trust and support, being able to assume the perspective of one's students, and a great deal of time and effort.

For teachers to be thoughtful curriculum developers, they must be invested students of their own beliefs and practices--individually and collectively. They must be concerned about the effects of their decisions for all their learners and the cultures and communities represented in their work settings. Foremost, they must keep in mind their knowledge and feelings about art as a special way of knowing--about many things: visual objects and spaces, and their perceived qualities and beauty; the conferring of form on raw materials through imagination, technical skill, and revision; the creative process; culture(s); rule making and rule breaking; expression; meaning making; human relations and politics; social criticism; history; and place. Without reminding ourselves of what we personally know and feel about art, we have difficulty articulating to ourselves and others what it means to teach and learn art.

There is much that is disturbingly unaesthetic and oppressive about the life world of art and music teachers due to their working conditions and lack of professional support within and beyond their disciplines. All teachers--particularly those in the arts--deserve to feel "wide awake," engaged with the world, perplexed, surprised, joyful, humble, playful, cherished, competent, and confident to educate themselves and others. Our task is to create more opportunities for teachers to feel this way through the arts and through curriculum deliberation.

References

Ashton-Warner, S. (1964). Teacher. Toronto: Bantam Books.

Atkins, E. (1986). The deliberative process: An analysis from three perspectives. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 1, 265-293.

Berlak, A., & Berlak, H. (1981). Dilemmas of schooling. New York: Methuen.

Bolin, F. (1987). The teacher as curriculum decision maker. In F. Bolin & J. Falk (Eds.), Teacher renewal: Professional issues, personal choices (pp. 92-108). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bolin, F., & Falk, J. (Eds.). (1987). Teacher renewal: Professional issues, personal choices. New York: Teachers College Press.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). Reflection: Turning experience into learning. New York: Nichols.

Brubaker, D. (1982). Curriculum planning: The dynamics of theory and practice. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Buchmann, M. (1988). Practical arguments are no accounts of teacher thinking: But then, what is? (Occasional Paper No. 119). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (1988). Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience. New York: Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice in education. In C. McMurry (Ed.), The third yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eisner, E. (1985). The educational imagination. New York: Macmillan.

Gauthier, D. P. (1963). Practical reasoning: The structure and foundations of prudential and moral arguments and their exemplification in discourse. England: Oxford University Press.

Glatthorn, A. (1987). Curriculum leadership. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greene, M. (1978). Landscapes of learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Habermas, J. (1971). Knowledge and human interests. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hall, G., & Hord, S. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hall, G., & Loucks, S. (1979). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hamblen, K. (1985). The issue of technocratic rationality in discipline-based art education. Studies in Art Education, 27(1), 43-46.

Holly, M. (1984). Keeping a personal-professional journal. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Hopkins, D. (1985). A teacher's guide to classroom research. Milton Keynes, England: Open University Press.

Howey, K., & Vaughn, J. (1983). Current patterns of staff development. In G. Griffin (Ed.), The 82nd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Huebner, D. (1966). Curricular language and classroom meaning. In J. Macdonald (Ed.), Language and meaning. Washington, DC: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Hunt, D. E. (1987). Beginning with ourselves: Practice, theory and human affairs. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.

Jackson, P. (1987). Mainstreaming art: An essay on discipline-based art education. Educational Researcher, 16(6), 39-43.

Johnson, N. (1985, April). Teaching and learning in art: The acquisition of art knowledge in an eighth-grade class. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1982). The action research planner. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Lortie, D. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

May, W. (1985). What art means to third and fourth graders: A two-year case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus.

May, W. (1987). Student responses to media: Implications for elementary art curriculum. Studies in Art Education, 28(2), 105-117.

May, W. (1988a, April). Teachers' visual images of curriculum development: Themes of professional inequity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

May, W. (1988b, April). Understanding curriculum history via visual expression. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

May, W. (1989). Teachers, teaching, and the workplace: Omissions in curriculum reform. Studies in Art Education, 30(3), 142-156.

May, W. (in press). Good teachers making the best of it: Case studies of elementary art and music teaching (Technical Report). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching, Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects.

May, W., & Zimpher, N. (1986). An examination of three theoretical perspectives on supervision: Perceptions of preservice field supervision. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 1, 83-99.

Reid, W. (1978). Thinking about the curriculum: The nature and treatment of curriculum problems. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Schiffer, J. (1979). A framework for staff development. In A. Lieberman & L. Miller (Eds.), Staff development: New demands, new realities, new perspectives (pp. 4-22). New York: Teachers College Press.

Schwab, J. (1962). The teaching of science as enquiry. In J. Schwab & P.Brandwein (Eds.), The teaching of science. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. Educational Researcher, 15, 4-14.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. Harvard Educational Review, 57, 1-22.

Tikunoff, L. W., & Mergendollar, J. (1983). Inquiry as a means for professional growth. In G. Griffin (Ed.), The 82nd yearbook of the Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

van Manen, M. (1982). Edifying theory: Serving the good. Theory into Practice, 21(1), 44-49.

Walker, D. (1971). A naturalistic model for curriculum development. School Review, 80(1), 51-69.

Walker, D. (1990). Fundamentals of curriculum. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Walker, R. (1985). Doing research: A handbook for teachers. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, S. (1989). A case concerning content: Using case studies to teach subject matter (Craft Paper 89-1). East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Center for Research on Teacher Education.

Woolf, H. (Ed.). (1977). Webster's new collegiate dictionary. Springfield, MA: G & C Merriam.

Zimpher, N., & Howey, K. (1987). Adapting supervisory practices to different orientations of teaching competence. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 2(2), 101-127.